

ANOTHER FACE OF JANUS **(The Nature of Leadership and its Relation to Management)**

II. The Outlines of a New Theory¹

Armen E. Petrosyan

Abstract

Leadership, as well as management, is closely related to the rule in human groups that – in the very broad sense – may be divided into two categories: formal organizations and informal associations. Rule in the formal groups manifests itself predominantly as administration. As to the informal their inherent mode of rule is governance.

In its turn, the chief method of administration is management while governance mostly employs leadership as the main channel of influencing people. Thus, representing two faces of the rule, leadership and management appear as twin-born antipodes. They have opposite orientations and a common intention – forcing people to attain the goals set.

Omnis habet geminas, hinc atque hinc,
janua frontes,
E quibus haec populum pectat,
at illa larem.
*Publius Ovidius Naso. Fasti.*²

Leadership is neither a special function of management nor an alter ego nestled in the manager's soul but opposing to his "true" self. To the contrary, leader possesses a number of qualities imparting to him a certain peculiarity what distinguishes leadership from all other manifestations of the human nature. Leaders have a unique scope as well as some particular instruments of carrying out their tasks. In short, leadership coincides not in the least with management and is, in a sense, even its antipode.

1. Rule in Human Groups

Manager uses specified, quantitatively defined, and temporally anchored goals commonly named objectives in order to discipline the activity of his people and bring it into some limits. This allows him to give distinctness to their actions and create an opportunity of checking up and correcting the results obtained. A worker performs the task assigned to him because it corresponds, ultimately, to his interests. That is to say, the commitment to the organizational goals becomes, to a person, a means of satisfying his own wants.

Manager has to stimulate his subordinates in order to get them acting. They should be persuaded that there is an undoubted connection between the effort made and the implementation of their personal plans. Otherwise the organizational objectives scarcely can be attained.

To set going the mechanism of feedback manager must make the best use of the factors of rewards and punishment. That allows of consolidating the "right" actions and cutting off or suppressing the "wrong". But it requires testing results obtained, monitoring trends of the activity, correcting them when necessary, and sometimes even revising the

¹ First published in: Credo new. 2010. N 4.

² Ovid. The Fasti of Ovid. L.: Macmillan, 1909. P. 6.

Every door has two faces, this and that,
Whereof one looks outwards and the other inwards.

initial objectives. Taken together that constitutes the system of control introduced into the organization's body.

In leadership, the emphasis is, contrariwise, placed on the "vague" visions - not so much presetting the orientation and the character of the followers' activity as inducing in them a willingness to act. By their nature, these visions are dreams rather than aims to be achieved.³

The actions conforming to the visions shared are taken by the followers as something in keeping with their wants and hopes. That is why they do not need any additional incentives. The adherents' motives immediately manifest themselves in the leader's vision and thereby further its "appropriation". That vision is realized not as something imposed from outside but as an embodiment of the people's own aspirations.

But if the followers take the actions made under the leader's influence as something absolutely necessary is it worth to resort to the measures of coercion? In their inner frame of reference, the "weight" of the common vision is not less, and therefore it serves even a more reliable instrument of inducing to act than any – tangible or intangible – promises. Consequently, the followers – at least those who are not cunning and follow the leader sincerely, without any secret thoughts - will, anyway, evince a high self-devotion.⁴

Hence it becomes clear that the demonstration of commitment to the vision announced and the vivid examples of the "right" behavior turns into a top priority of the leader. Being learn by the adherents, these examples constitute, in fact, the framework of their activity and a kind of "quasi-control" mechanism preventing unwanted deviations and keeping the people's behavior within certain tolerable limits.⁵

However it would be an exaggeration to state that management and leadership are entirely independent of and mutually indifferent to each other. There are a lot of subtle threads that bind and draw them together and even make of them a kind of alliance. The point is that they both are manifestations of another, more fundamental human potency named rule. It embraces all the forms of guiding and influencing people for the purpose of reaching the results intended, through their hands.

The rule means any exercise of authority, control, or domination. It implies heading individuals and collectives in the broadest sense of the word, including all the instances concerned with the relations of power and subjection.

The mechanism of ruling consists of three basic components – goals, driving forces, and feedback. But, naturally, it cannot be uniform and undifferentiated. Since the mechanism is applied to various or even opposite tasks the forms taken by rule are not in the least identical forms. The same refers also to its methods applied. They comply with the objects to be ruled as well as with the forms of ruling.

The human groups needing rule are divided into two extremely broad categories: formal, officially established and strictly ordered, organizations and informal associations that not necessarily emerge and develop spontaneously but, in any case, do not acquire some distinctive branchy structure, retaining a sufficient freedom of interactions for their members.

A formal organization may be defined as a union of people whose participation is determined, predominantly, by their personal interests. It provides for officially established functional roles (positions) and vertically integrated (hierarchical) structure, strictly formulated regulatives, and authorities and responsibilities for separate members. The inducement to work is based there on the individual motivation and stimulation, and the

³ Petrosyan A. E. The Arsenal of Leadership: Vision as a Vague Image // New Management. 2010. № 7.

⁴ Petrosyan A. E. The Arsenal of Leadership: The Mechanism of Inspiration // New Management. 2010. № 9.

⁵ Petrosyan A. E. The Arsenal of Leadership: The Embodiment of Due Behavior // New Management. 2010. № 10.

activity itself is subjected to regular and systematical evaluation and modification according to explicitly expressed common (organizational) goals.

Something directly opposite occurs in association which It represents a union of people who are encouraged by their aspirations and beliefs. The positions of members are here much more uniform and the interactions between them chiefly horizontal (equal in rights). The inducement to activity arises from their common attitudes and unity of expectations, what ensures collective inspiration, and the appraisal of the deeds proceeds from their correspondence to the adopted standards (models) of behavior.

Clear, these two kinds of human associations by no means exhaust all their variety. They constitute only the two poles between which nestles a whole chain of diverse intermediate (transitional) forms. However any real organization, even the most remote from the both poles, is not something quite different from them but combine - in some proportions – their features.

2. The Forms of Rule

Certainly, it would be very strange to suppose that so diverse, if not to say - opposite, people's unions must be ruled in the same manner. To the contrary, the forms and methods of rule, being used have to differ essentially when striving to achieve the manifold goals intended. No wonder that the mankind, over its long history, has worked out and successfully employed these forms and methods even without going deeply into their nature and peculiarities.

A cursory examination of informal unions is enough to notice that the chief thing to do in them is identifying the directions people must move in, developing the policy complied with the landmarks recognized, and presetting some "reasonable" examples of behavior, ensuring advancement towards the desired future. As regards formal organizations they – just because of goals to be more specified and well defined - provide for a more sophisticated mechanism of attaching to them the personal interests of separate members and their stimulating their activity, and of the permanent control of the work and non-admission of current and especially final results to go out of established limits. That is quite another form of rule, which prefers feeling the pulse of the organization's everyday life instead of having a bird's-eye view of it.

The first mode of rule is called governance. Its meaning comes from "to give direction" or "to set an example". Not in vain one of the archaic but persisting meanings of the word consists in "moral conduct or behavior". In contemporary context, "to govern" means "to exercise of authority over" or "to perform functions for a political unit". That is to say, it is a question not of power within a specified organizational structure but of authorities regarding some sufficient uniform mass beyond that structure (for instance, of a state body with respect to the people or of a municipality with respect to population of the territory).

Governors set directions of further development, work out political tack, and establish the order circumscribing the citizens' freedom of actions, but do not interfere in their private life, set them objectives, or evaluate every step. In short, those governing people do not grasp them by the hand unless the latter break the law.

Granted, the governance is likened sometimes to the power construction of the formal organizations. This kind of models can be found in various antiutopias such as "Ourselves" of Yevgeniy Zamyatin or George Orwell's "1984". But in practice, they are met only under totalitarian regimes when the society itself turns virtually into a formal organization.⁶

⁶ Petrosyan A. E. The Advent of Totalitarianism: A Jump by the Kingdom of Freedom // Scientific Herald of Omsk Academy of Law Enforcement. 2009. № 1; idem. Totalitarianism: The Poverty of Messianizm // Credo New. 2009. № 1.

However the totalitarian power is still an intolerable extreme. Not to mention that such a power should be overcome in every possible way it cannot come into practice in corpore (in full measure).

The second form of rule is peculiar to the formal organizations. It is known as administration, and more concerned with the conduct of everyday affairs and the solution of specified problems. The policy making – as far as it is carried out at all – represents, within the framework of administration, a secondary task going beyond its focus. And that is quite natural. After all, there exist, in formal organizations, officially confirmed persistent goals, strict rules of behavior, and highly developed division of labour. They rigorously constrain the arbitrariness and the spontaneous actions of the head. As to the questions of policy or strategic re-orientation they arise only at the deep-lunged torques when the previous “formalization” of activity (goals, structures, and rules) cease to favour to achieve much success and, rather, begin to play a role of “strait-jacket” binding the initiative of both the heads and their people.

Sure, it does not mean that the formal organizations content themselves with administration whereas the informal know nothing else but governance. So, the president governs the state. But to execute his office he resorts to the service of his staff which, being a part of the state machinery, represents a formal organization requiring some inner rule. And the latter is carried out just in the form of administration.

Even in corporations – typical formal organizations – there are elements that do not concern immediately the inner structure and as if tower over it. To them pertain, for instance, Boards of Directors or Review boards. They do not take part in the current activity of the organization and have no right to impact on the decisions of their managers or even ordinary workers. Nevertheless those organs are very influential. It is just them that establish the long-term goals, adopt the strategies of development, and sometimes make the appointments to the top positions. So bodies govern formal organizations but not administer them. Their function is as if taken out of the organizational boundaries - not to break the unity and consistency of administration.

Thus, governance, as well as administration, is used in both formal and informal organizations. The only difference is what place these modes of rule take there, and what are their roles. The function of administration in informal associations as well as of governance in formal organizations is secondary. It recedes into the background. However the significance of administration or governance is, in such cases, not merely subservient. Just as administration becomes the chief form of rule within the authority bodies (institutions), so governance turns out the main way of influence in the “external” (taken out) bodies of formal organizations.

But since administration and governance are peculiar to the different unions of people and are of the principally diverse nature they must evidently employ non-identical methods of influencing people, the most conforming to their particular tasks. Just such instruments of executing rule are management and leadership. The first relates to administration and the second to governance.

Manager expresses the goals in the form of specified objectives complying with the interests of his organization, impel the workers – through securing their personal interests and offering them attractive incentives – to join the common efforts and together fulfill the actions intended, and sets going the machinery of control to ensure the appropriateness and opportuneness of the actions taken. As to leader he transforms his own goal into a dream of followers, excites in them an inner desire to achieve it (the inspiration as a driving force), and “exemplifies” the due behavior (the embodiment of the “right” conduct as a special

mechanism of feedback) and thereby as if automates the “control” over his adherents’ activity. That allows him to secure both their self-devotion and yearning for unity of efforts (table 1).

Table 1. The Grading of Rule

<i>Elements of Rule</i>	Kinds and Descriptions	
Objects	<i>Formal rganization</i>	<i>Informal association</i>
	A people’s union participation in which is determined by their personal interests, with officially established functional roles (positions) and vertically integrated (hierarchical) structure as well as authorities and responsibilities of separate members. The inducement to activity is based on the individual motivation and stimulation. Workers’ performance is subjected to systematical evaluation, correction, and modification according to the explicitly formulated common (organizational) goals	A people’ union participation in which is determined by their aspirations and beliefs, with uniform positions of separate members and predominantly horizontal (equal in rights) interactions between the members. The inducement to activity is based on the collective inspiration (common attitudes and the unity of expectations). The evaluation of adherents’ performance is usually of non-systematic and unofficial nature and made according to adopted “standards” (patterns) of behavior
Forms	<i>Administration</i>	Governance
	The rule concerned with the conduct of everyday affairs and specified problems to be solved. It implies designation of the substance of activity, the structure and functions of the organization, its staff body and rather strict regulatives of behavior	The execution of power, or the carrying-out of functions of authorities as respects to a rather homogenous (practically unstructured) aggregation of people. It includes the identification of the directions of development, the working-out of the political tack, the establishment of general laws (prescriptions) constraining the freedom of action for the members
Methods	<i>Management</i>	<i>Leadership</i>
	Setting objectives conforming to the organizational interests, impelling workers – through “engaging” their personal interests and offering them attractive stimuli – to join efforts and carry out together the actions intended, as well as starting up the mechanism of control and feedback	Transforming the goal (vision) into people’s dream, exciting in them an inner desire to fulfill it, and “automating” the control over their activity through “exemplifying” the due behavior (proffering patterns to stick to) and ensuring thereby the adherents’ self-devotion and unity of actions

Does it mean that leadership and management are incompatible, or where one of them is applied the other has no place? To put it simpler, can they be combined and used in the same association of people and even by the same person?

3. Scopes and Limits

It must be admitted that the formal and informal organizations are only some idealized models. They are met in their pure form extremely rare. Much more often, some “admixtures” – at times, very essential - of the opposite form are added to them. Besides – what is even more important, - the substantial part of associations is of a transitional nature. The rule in them represents a “dense” mix of governance and administration and therefore, naturally, requires a combination of management and leadership.

A vivid example of such associations is the case of military units. On the one hand, they represent, undoubtedly, formal organizations with an explicit hierarchical structure and crystallized functional roles. Under normal conditions, the rule is based here on the personal interests of the members (especially in the professional army - in contrast with the call-up). Besides, a rather rigid feedback is provided for - resting on strict mechanisms of control, reward and punishment. And this circumstance turns every unit head into a manager. But, on the other hand, as soon as the military unit gets into a situation for the sake of which it has been formed, that is, begins to conduct combat operations, little thing remains in it from the “normal” procedures of rule. The more intense the operations the higher is the strain and the less definite are their consequences and the harder is to maintain the standard (administrative) order of activity. The ability to govern people is brought to foreground and the leader qualities turn out more and more valuable.

While under usual, peace, conditions a unit head influences his people firstly through engaging their personal interests (salary, career development, etc.), in the extreme situations such a method of rule gets practically useless. The point is not only that people have too little time for realizing the situation and taking the proper steps. The personnel’s endeavour to satisfy its interests comes into collision with other powerful motives. Among them should be mentioned, for instance, striving to save life and health or to avoid overloads. Under such circumstances, the inspiration of people is much more effective than their stimulation. It needs to suggest them an unconditional willingness to accomplish the hard and dangerous tasks.

Such a state of affairs was, long ago, well realized by the militaries themselves which, rendering tribute to the methods of administration, nevertheless stressed the special importance of the leadership elements. “What is your first consideration if you wish to succeed in the military service?” - asked C. Andrews, an American brigadier-general, in the end of World War I. His answer was unambiguous: such a person must “be a good team captain”. That requires, if not to count being a disciplinarian, “that you acquire and use these qualities that characterize natural leaders of men. In all dealing with your men you must have their respect, unhesitating obedience, and, if you are man enough to win it their enthusiastic loyalty”.⁷ In other words, although the commander has the right to demand of subordinates to execute his order and, if necessary, to impose some penalty upon them it is much more preferable when they understand its sense and implications and strive to fulfill operations required, as well as possible. And in battlefield, the inspiration and “exemplification” (embodiment of the “right” behavior) practically displace all other means of influencing people.

⁷ Andrews L. C. Leadership and Military Tradition. Philadelphia, L.: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1918. P. 26.

Certainly, qualities managers and leaders need are far from being always combined in a person. Many outstanding leaders turn out worthless managers just as sometimes excellent managers do not possess leader traits. However other cases when they join these qualities are also known. Such a person was, for instance, H. Ford. If to tell of our contemporaries, among the first come to mind W. Gates and S. Jobs. They both not merely had succeeded in creating new – large and promising – organizations but also systematically advanced them to the most top achievements.

Moreover, the both groups of qualities are inherent in many people. The question is only about the amount and proportions of these features. That's why it is not worth to put insurmountable bounds between them. Not rare are situations when a manager has to turn into a leader or – vice versa – a leader is forced to function as a manager.

In principle, if all the associations were homogenous in themselves and operated under standard and invariable conditions their heads scarcely would have any need for combining such opposite qualities. Both managers and leaders would then get by with their own “toolkits” - without resorting to an “alien” armoury.

But unfortunately, the situation does not remain regular. As a result, the structure of a formal organization is eroded with the lapse of time, and the old rules begin to constrain the freedom of manoeuvre and keep back the initiative of the members. When such changes reach a critical level the habitual toolkit inevitably fails. To take the situation over the control again the manager has nothing but to resort to leader methods of influencing people.

Leadership and management not merely differ from each other but represent quite diverse and, in a sense, even opposite ways of rule. True, both they have almost the same destination – attaining the results intended, through the efforts of other people the influence is exerted on. However the instruments used at that are very dissimilar. That's why an indefatigable yearning for leadership in formal organizations (enterprises, institutions, public bodies, and so on), which turns now into a true craze seems to be rather funny.

Thus, according to an informed non-government agency, by the beginning of this century, more than 70 percents of Canadian chief executives saw building leader capability their most important business priority.⁸ They neglected the simple truth that leadership in business organizations is appropriate only on a limited scale and under certain conditions to be regarded as anomalous rather than regular.

The hypertrophied picture of scope and possibilities of leadership is so wide-spread that many consider it incontestable. Nevertheless it is no more than all the rage of the unsteady fashion, which, no wonder, meets some resistance – sometimes in the form of an opposite extreme. In such cases, not merely the merits of leadership are put in doubt. Leadership itself gets depicted as an ersatz mechanism of influencing the workers, which threatens the organization with degradation and degeneration.

At times, leadership is reduced at all to the level of an “alienating social myth” an “alienating social myth” that rather than empowering organizations deskills employees and creates an excessive dependency of workers. “The leadership myth”, G. Gemmill and J. Oakley state, “functions as a social defense whose central aim is to repress uncomfortable needs, emotions, and witnesses that emerge when people attempt to work together”.⁹ It is assumed that the dependency on the leader figure offers them a sense of meaning, direction, and purpose.

However such critics of leadership hardly can be admitted as correct. They would have some reason if leadership does not play an autonomous role. But it is, certainly, not the case.

⁸ Leadership for Tomorrow: A Challenge for Business Today. Ottawa: Author, 2001.

⁹ Gemmill G., Oakley J. Leadership: An Alienating Social Myth // Human Relations. 1992. Vol. 45. № 2. P. 123.

Besides that leadership is the chief means of influencing people in associations, from time to time it comes to foreground even in formal organizations. It occurs not so often and lasts not too long, though. Nevertheless just these rare and short periods get a paramount importance, for they are related to the critical situations determining the probability of the organization's survival or passage into a qualitatively new state. It is rather strange to disregard so important factor and, naming it an "alienating myth", repudiate getting into its marrow.

More temperate is the approach of J. Gosling and H. Mintzberg. They also express a natural discontent with the idolization of leadership. By their mordant notice, leadership today has nearly devoured management. "Most of us", they say, "have become so enamoured of "leadership" that "management" has been pushed into the background. Nobody aspires to be a good manager anymore; everybody wants to be great leader". Certainly, one must agree with them that it is a dangerous trend eroding the very foundation of formal organizations. But unfortunately, Gosling and Mintzberg see the threat only in that "the separation of management from leadership" occurs. In their opinion, "just as management without leadership encourages an uninspired style which deadens activities, leadership without management encourages a disconnected style, which promotes hubris".¹⁰ As it comes out, the problem consists merely in that instead of managers possessing no leader qualities can emerge leaders not able to administrate, what is barely a transition from one extreme to another.

Meanwhile, leaders without manager arsenal are not thus much awful as it might seem at the first glance. They also can be demanded by practice. So, the informal associations dealing with ordinary affairs are the most suitable field for them (especially at the higher levels). The role of such leaders does not yield, in importance, to that played, under like circumstances, by managers in formal organizations.

The chief peril related to overemphasizing the significance of leadership dwells in another plane. Turning one and all managers into leaders not only eliminates them as class but also abolish management as an independent "trade". Thereby, manager transmutes into a double-headed creature whose heads not merely look at the opposite ends but, sending him conflicting impulses, tear to pieces his everyday activity. As a result, instead of a high professional we get a professional schizophrenic that does not know what to prefer. As Bouridan's ass he rushes about between two haystacks, doomed to starvation.

Formal organizations acting mainly under normal circumstances require just management, not leadership. The situation changes as the conditions of activity go beyond the habitual scope. Then the role of leadership becomes more salient. And it reaches the apogee when the environment grows chaotized and extremely uncertain. But if the leader features penetrate the manager's activity in an ordinary situation and the "leaderization" of him occurs it brings inevitably to destruction of the stationary mechanisms of administration.

Instead of Conclusion: Twin-born Antipodes

The divergence of the forms and methods of rule had begun very early in the human history. The memory of it has been retained in the old legends adverting to the origins of society.

In the Roman mythology, a special place was taken by Janus, the God of all entrances and exits, baring and unbarring (from the Latin word "ianua" – door, gate). He had two faces

¹⁰ Gosling J., Mintzberg H. The Five Minds of Manager // Harvard Business Review. 2003. Vol. 81. № 11. P. 54 - 55.

looking at the opposite ends, and so Romans considered him to know the past as well as the future. His name was mentioned the first among the gods; they called Janus the “God of gods” and the “good creator”.

In “Fasti”, an Ovid’s poem, Janus states that the ancients named him Chaos, since he was from the old matter (*me Chaos antique nam sum res prisca vocabant*). From the shapeless mass resembling a lump (*globus et sine imagine moles*) he turned into a god and the keeper of the order, who revolve the axis of the world. Janus proclaims:

Quicquid ubique vides, caelum, mare, nubila, terras,

Omnia sunt nostra clausa patentque manu.

Me penes est unum vasti custodia mundi;

Et ius vertendi cardinis omne meum est.¹¹

And as a small sign of the previous chaotic state, the Janus head’s front and back still looked just the same. No wonder that he was regarded as the first ruler of the Latium (*rex latinorum*).

It is quite natural to surmise that Janus’ two faces correspond to the modes of rule whereof one is administration and the other governance. Not in vain Romans appealed to him in such a way:

Dexter ades ducibus, quorum segura labore

otia terra ferax, otia pontus agit:

Dexter ades patribusque tuis populoque Quirini

Et resera nutu candida templa tuo.¹²

One of Janus’ faces looks inwards (*larem*) and is addressed to chiefs (*ducibus*). It symbolizes management. The other face is turned outwards - to the nobility, the class of patricians whose mission consists in leading people. Originally, the both faces were only the different sides of rule as a single whole. But later – as the forms of activity were differentiated, and the division of “ruling labour” deepened – every face got an independent sense.

Granted, one can meet those who convert this dyad into a triad embracing, along with chiefs and the nobility, also the Roman people as a separate object of God’s attention. For instance, R. King claims that Ovid “prays for Janus favour upon three levels of government arranged in “descendent” tricolon” – “the emperor” and “imperial princes”, “senators”, and finally “the people of Quirinus”.¹³ The conclusion is drawn from the line already cited: “Dexter ades patribusque tuis populoque Quirini”.

Is it so?

Let us put aside the mysterious act of transforming “dux” (Latin “chief”, “head”, “commander” and, of course, “master”, “sovereign”) into the “emperor” or the “imperial

¹¹ Ovid. *The Fasti of Ovid*. L.: Macmillan, 1909. P. 5.

In English these lines could sound about so:

Whatever you see anywhere - sky, sea, clouds, earth, -

All things are closed and opened by my hands alone.

It’s just my hands that hold the guard of the huge world,

And its wheeling pole entirely pertains to me.

¹² Ovid. *The Fasti of Ovid*. P. 3 – 4.

English translation:

Justly treat the chiefs whose toil ensures

Peace to the fruitful earth, peace to the sea.

Justly treat the Roman people’s elite

And by thy nod unbar the white temples.

¹³ King R. J. *Desiring Rome: Male Subjectivity and Reading Ovid's Fasti*. Columbus (OH): Ohio State University, 2006. P. 69.

princes". Much more interesting is the emergence of "senators" and "people" instead of single elite. Apparently, King bases his interpretation on J. Frazer's translation sounding as:

"And come propitious to thy senators and the people of Quirinus".¹⁴

But it is only a fruit of a misunderstanding. Indeed, the expression "populus Quirini" stands for the "Roman people". The point is that the word "quirinus" (spear-bearing in Sabine), being for native inhabitants of the central Apennines an epithet of Mars, was extended next to Romulus. Therefore "populus Quirini" had gotten the meaning of "Romulus' people", as well as Rome had been named "urbs Quirini". However it results in no way from this that in Ovid's line the Roman people is mentioned along with the nobility.

The formulation used in "Fasti" has very ancient roots and the words figure there not necessarily in the sense habitual for us.

Namely, the usual meaning of "populus" as the people on the whole appeared rather late. Originally – up to Servius Tullius, that is, to the middle of VI century B. C., – this word signified, however strange it may seem, the nobility, or the patricians (Cicero's "populus plebesque Romana"), and only lot after, it had been extended to all the people ("senatus populusque Romanus"). In its turn, the term "plebs" underwent an opposite evolution. Denoting, at first, all the people, afterwards it had been reduced to the "commoners". So, in the end, the both terms began to coincide with each other in this respect, relating to common people, to the mass, or the crowd (Martialis' "populus patresque").

There is small wonder in such confusions at treating poetical texts. Incorrect translations occur fairly often, and they, naturally, mislead those getting them on faith. Thus, in the matter of the lines taken as epigraph for this article Frazer literally convey Ovid's words. As a result, the nonsense is begotten: "Every door has two fronts, this way and that, whereof one faces the people and the other the house-god".¹⁵ It remains a puzzle what the people doors look at, and where is the house-god being an object of door's "glazing". But it needs only to clarify the sense of these Roman colloquialisms - and all will have taken straight away the proper places.

In this case, "populus" signifies the "street" and "populum spectare" means no more than "to be turned to outside". So spoke Romans about the external "face" of front door. The same concerns also the house-god. Latin word "lar" denoted the "master spirit" and was frequently used in the respect of brownies (lares domestici or familiares). But it was also the symbol of hearth, dwelling (as in Cicero's famous phrase "Ad suum larem familiarem reverti") or even a poetic sign for nest (let us recall Ovid's "avis tecta laremque parat").

Coming back to the differentiation between leadership and management, one may claim that it occurred from the very beginnings of social rule. As administration and governance had been crystallized, they began to act, in certain extent, on their own and independently of each other. However, when one of them does not cope with the task it remains nothing but to remember the second and to resort to its aide. That's why though management and leadership are real antipodes they cannot be entirely disjoined from each other. They are not two heads on a neck but two faces of the same head called for ruling. And subject to the function executed - administration or governance – the Janus turns to it the one or the other of his faces.

¹⁴ Ovid's Fasti. With an English translation by J. G. Frazer. L.: William Heinemann, 1959. P. 7.

¹⁵ Ovid's Fasti. With an English translation by J. G. Frazer. P. 11 – 12.